

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

REGENERATION AND DEVELOPMENT PANEL

Minutes from the Meeting of the Regeneration and Development Panel held on Wednesday, 11th January, 2017 at 6.00 pm in the Committee Suite, King's Court, Chapel Street, King's Lynn

PRESENT: Councillors P Gidney (Chairman), Miss L Bambridge, Mrs J Collingham, Mrs S Collop (substitute for Mrs S Buck), J Collop (substitute for I Gourlay), M Chenery of Horsbrugh, M Howland, P Kunes, D Pope (substitute for C J Crofts), P Rochford and Mrs E Watson

Portfolio Holders

Councillor R Blunt - Portfolio Holder for Development

Councillor B Long - Leader of the Council

Councillor Mrs E Nockolds – Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Health

Officers:

Chris Bamfield – Executive Director

Martin Chisholm – Business Manager

Alex Fradley - Planner

Alan Gomm – LDF Manager

Ray Harding – Chief Executive

RD85: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Buck, Crofts and Gourlay.

RD86: MINUTES

RESOLVED: The minutes from the previous meeting were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendment proposed by the Chairman.

Page 618, RD80: Riverfront Delivery Plan, paragraph four be amended to read:

The Chairman informed those present that he had previously been Project Manager for the North Sea Haven project and he provided information on weaknesses in the area, siltation, engineering and drainage. He also referred to the idea of opening up the inland waterways and felt that this could be achieved by creating some mooring ponds near the Southgates. The Environment Agency and other Stakeholders were able to help at the time but felt that the opportunity had now been lost. The Chairman commented that traffic was an issue in King's Lynn and something needed to be done to assist the traffic flow in King's Lynn.

RD87: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bambridge declared an interest in the letter which had been submitted as Chairman's Correspondence as she was a Member of St Margaret's with St Nicholas' Ward Forum who had sent a copy of a letter to the Chairman with regards to the Riverfront Delivery Plan.

RD88: URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

RD89: MEMBERS PRESENT PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 34

Councillor Bubb – RD91 – Transport.

RD90: CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE

The Chairman informed those present that he had been copied into a letter from St Margaret's with St Nicholas' Ward Forum. A copy of the letter had been circulated to Members of the Panel in advance of the Meeting.

Councillor Kunes commented that he felt in general the letter was quite negative. He explained that as the Quay was a working Quay, it was unlikely that railings would be permitted along the Quay side unless they were removable.

The Chairman referred to comments regarding a multi storey car park on the Quay and commented that any proposals should be in keeping with the area and felt that one way could be to mix the car park with commercial use, for example put a restaurant and observation deck on the top floor. Councillor Bambridge commented that the possibility of a car park had been discussed many years ago and how it could be a multi-use area, but this was never taken forward.

Comments were also made that the area was allocated for housing and the Executive Director confirmed that there was currently no proposal to add a multi-storey car park to the area. He reminded the Panel that following the public consultation, options would be brought back to the Regeneration and Development Panel for consideration.

The LDF Manager confirmed that Boal Quay had been allocated for housing within the Local Plan. He explained that due to the flood risk it was likely that residential development would only be permitted on upper storeys which meant that different uses could be considered for the ground floor, for example commercial or car parking.

The Letter from the Forum had also been sent to the Regeneration Team as part of the options consultation and would be reviewed by the team to assist in the development of the preferred options which would be developed and published for consultation in the Spring.

RD91: **TRANSPORT**

The Chairman explained that he had requested that this item be added to the agenda as he felt that issues with traffic in the town centre were getting worse. He suggested that the Panel could look at issues and come up with ideas and potential solutions. The Chairman provided examples of accidents which had happened in the town centre and had resulted in queuing traffic and problem areas.

Councillor Mrs Collingham explained that she had previously suggested a park and ride trial using an empty field next to the hospital, but she had been told that the traffic levels in King's Lynn would not make a park and ride facility viable. She commented that she would like park and ride to be investigated by the Panel as a solution to the traffic issues in King's Lynn.

Councillor Bambridge commented that she felt that the traffic in King's Lynn had been worse since the new timed traffic lights had been installed.

Councillor Baron Chenery of Horsburgh asked if the Chairman was suggesting if just issues in King's Lynn be looked at, or the wider Borough. He also asked if other transport issues such as Railways could be considered. The Chairman suggested that initially the Panel should focus on traffic in King's Lynn, but could look at other areas in the future.

Councillor Kunes commented that one way to alleviate traffic heading south out of King's Lynn would be to open up Hardings Way bus route to traffic although he acknowledged that some local residents were opposed to this solution.

The Vice Chairman, Councillor Rochford, commented that the problem was that King's Lynn could not be looked at in isolation, the focus needed to be on the long term. He explained that any proposals in the future to alleviate traffic in King's Lynn needed to consider that the town was a mediaeval town, with little opportunity to change road layouts, and the use of the car would increase. It was not an option to reduce the amount of vehicles in the town centre, instead ways to manage the traffic needed to be looked at. The Vice Chairman also referred to businesses in the town centre and surrounding King's Lynn which had lots of employees. He suggested that work be carried out with the bigger businesses to look at how traffic issues could be resolved, for example shuttle busses, or additional bus services.

Councillor Mrs Watson commented that traffic on the A149 had a knock on effect on traffic issues in the town centre, especially during the holiday season. She felt that if options to alleviate issues in this area were looked at, this could assist with issues in the town centre.

The Chairman thanked Members of the Panel for their comments and reminded them that King's Lynn would expand, more houses would be built and this would add to the amount of traffic in the area.

The Business Manager summarised the comments made by the Panel and suggested a possible way forward. He explained that some of the issues raised related to operational issues, for example synchronisation of traffic lights, and details of issues could be passed onto the Norfolk County Council Highways Operational Team. The Business Manager explained that the issues regarding traffic being backed up due to an accident on one of the main routes, could be passed onto the tactical teams including the Police, Norfolk County Council and the Borough Council. He explained that the Police and Norfolk County Council were already doing some work in this area following a recent incident in a different part of the Borough which had caused issues with traffic flow. The Business Manager also felt that the Panel wanted to look at strategic issues and long term considerations.

The Business Manager suggested that the next step for the Panel could be to invite representatives from Norfolk County Council Highways to a future meeting of the Regeneration and Development Panel to gather more information on what was happening now and what was planned for the future. The Panel could then decide on how they could potentially be involved in the future and suggest ways that issues could be tackled.

The Portfolio Holder for Development, Councillor Blunt welcomed the suggestions made by the Business Manager and commented that he felt it was important for the Panel to initially know background information and have an understanding of what was already planned for the future.

The Vice Chairman suggested that the King's Lynn Area Consultative Committee could be invited to the meeting when Norfolk County Council officers were present.

The LDF Manager reminded the Panel of the King's Lynn Area Transport Study which had been used in the formulation of the Local Plan. He also reminded Members that the Council had an Air Quality Management Plan, which included an action plan. The Panel was reminded that the Environment and Community Panel received annual updates on Air Quality from the Environmental Health Manager.

The LDF Manager also informed the Panel that Norfolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council had recently commissioned a study on behalf of the Local Enterprise Partnerships to look at the A10 corridor.

RESOLVED: That representatives from Norfolk County Council Highways be invited to a future meeting of the Panel and the King's Lynn Area Consultative Committee be invited to the meeting.

RD92: **UPDATE ON THE FIVE YEAR LAND SUPPLY**

The LDF Manager reminded the Panel that the Council was required, by Government, to have a five year supply of deliverable housing in the Borough. He referred to the National Planning Policy Framework. He explained that the figure was calculated and continually monitored. It was also published on the website on an annual basis as part of the Annual Monitoring report. He explained that the Monitoring report provided the technical detail on how the figure was calculated.

The Panel was informed that in calculating the five year housing supply, the following were taken into consideration:

- The Full Objective Assessment Need which was a document provided by Government and included detail of household growth and population.
- The number of units required per annum.
- Allocations from the Local Plan.
- The amount of Planning Permissions granted.
- Permissions which were unlikely to result in development.
- Lapsed Planning Permissions.

The LDF Manager explained that the Council currently had a 5.81 years supply of housing. He also made reference to Planning Inquiries and appeals in which the view that the Council had a five year supply was thoroughly tested.

The Panel was informed that the next Annual Monitoring report would be published at the end of the financial year.

The LDF Manager explained the technicalities of the calculation and how monitoring was carried out. He explained that 66% of sites allocated in the Local Plan had currently come forward with some sort of planning application and the current plan period was to 2026.

The Portfolio Holder for Development, Councillor Blunt explained that the process was very technical and he was confident that the Council had demonstrated that they had a five year supply of housing.

The Chairman thanked officers for their update and invited questions and comments from the Panel, as summarised below.

In response to a question regarding the delay between outline planning permission being granted and development on site, the Planner explained that he was not sure on the actual figure, but he explained that information on past time periods was used in the calculation. The LDF Manager agreed to circulate an information sheet to the Panel on time periods.

The LDF Manager explained that allowances were made for sites which would not come forward and this was factored into the calculation. The lapse rate of three years was also included.

RESOLVED: The update was noted.

RD93: **STRUCTURE OF THE PANEL**

Councillor Mrs Collingham provided a report to the Panel and a presentation (attached) on the structure of the Panel and content of meetings. She explained that she had used the agenda items considered by the Panel at a previous meeting as an example of a way a meeting could be run in the future. She highlighted the following points:

- Reports or updates which are for information only or background setting, should be limited to twenty minutes.
- Creating a SWOT analysis for items.
- How do projects fit in with the vision for King's Lynn?
- Questions from Members could be sent to the Chairman or officers in advance and tabled at the meeting.
- The Panel's ability to establish Informal Working Groups.
- The opportunity to be involved in projects at an early stage.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Mrs Collingham for her report and presentation and invited questions and comments from the Panel, as summarised below.

Councillor Pope suggested that Members of the Panel have a read of the Urban Renaissance Strategy which provided a development strategy for the town and had been prepared by consultants on behalf of the Council. The Clerk to the Panel agreed to circulate the document to Panel Members via email.

The Panel generally agreed that they would like to have more input on projects at the beginning of their lifecycle and see projects all the way through. Projects could then be presented to the Corporate Performance Panel for post-evaluation.

Councillor John Collop commented that it was important that the public were consulted during projects and this should be a consideration of the Panel. He also felt that financial issues should not be discussed by the Regeneration and Development Panel and instead should be presented to the Corporate Performance Panel. Councillor Mrs Collingham commented that her presentation in no way suggested that work should be taken away from other Panels, but felt that knowing how projects were funded and how much they would cost would be important to the Regeneration and Development Panel when considering them.

The Chairman reminded those present that any Councillor could attend any meeting under Standing Order 34. Representatives from other Panels could also come under Standing Order 34 and present collective views from their respective Panel or Committee.

The Executive Director summarised the comments made by the Panel in that they would like to be involved in projects in their initial stages, this would be before financial implications were known. Councillor Mrs Collingham commented that when considering projects the Panel could also factor in who should be consulted on the project and at which stages.

The Chairman explained that he would pass on the comments of the Panel at his next joint meeting with Panel and Committee Chairmen and the Leader of the Council.

RD94: **WORK PROGRAMME**

Members of the Panel were reminded that an eform was available on the Intranet which could be completed and submitted if Members had items which they would like to be considered for addition to the Work Programme.

The following items were suggested for inclusion on the work programme.

1. Transport – as discussed earlier in the meeting. Officers from Norfolk County Council to be invited to a future meeting of the Panel.

2. NORA – The Chairman asked if it would be possible for a timeline of when the NORA project would finish. The Chairman felt that an update on the history of the site and the different projects ongoing would be useful for the Panel. He explained that it would be difficult to put an end date on the project as some of the schemes were subject to commercial investment.

The Chief Executive stated that NORA was made up of lots of different projects including the following:

- NORA Major Housing Scheme.

- Enterprise Zone
- Acquisition of Morston Asset and HCA land on NORA

The Chief Executive explained that the Panel could be updated on the different projects on the site and this would be added to the Work Programme.

3. Railways. The Chairman requested that the state of preserved Railway tracks and potential uses in the future be added to the Work Programme. He also asked for an update on the Ely North Junction improvements.

The Chief Executive explained that a report could be provided to the Panel on progress with the Ely North Junction improvements, the possibility of longer trains and half hourly service from King's Lynn. The Chief Executive informed the Panel that a joint Authority Group, made up of officers from Local Authorities along the rail routes, representatives from Network Rail, train operators, freight operators and the Local Enterprise Partnerships met on a regular basis to work on the design and feasibility work for the improvements ready for the 2019 funding period. The Chief Executive agreed to arrange for an update to be presented to the Panel at a future meeting.

RESOLVED: (i) The Panel's Work Programme was noted.
(ii) The above mentioned items be added to the Panel's Work Programme.

RD95: **DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Regeneration and Development Panel would be held on **Wednesday 15th February 2017** at 6.00pm in the Committee Suite, King's Court, Chapel Street, King's Lynn, Norfolk, PE30 1EX.

The meeting closed at 7.30 pm

PANEL STRUCTURE AND CONTENT

Example of an Agenda

- Guildhall – recommendation? – progress – any roadblocks – future discussion around how to market the building once refurbished.
- Waterfront Development
 - Future Consideration eg: 2018/19 – SWOT analysis for breakout and discussion
- Information only – eg update on KLIC - 20 mins max
 - Highlight any issues eg:
 - Occupancy rate
 - Long term occupancy
 - Core tenant

WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT

- **Demonstrating Need and how this has been identified**
- **Items for future consideration :**
- Current state of project
- Future action on project
- How does this project fit with vision for Kings Lynn
- Issues to overcome or consider

STRENGTHS

- Situation/ location close to historic Lynn
- Historic Building
- Waterfront and amenities
- Not part of “downtown” Lynn – ie association with historic/amenity area

WEAKNESSES

- Cost of development
- How to attract developer – where is the data on what might be a commercial interest?
- Distance from centre of Lynn too far to walk for shopping?
- Transport links
- How does this fit with a vision for Lynn*

OPPORTUNITIES

- Visually prime location
- Residential occupancy – fine views – both for retirees, single occupancy
- Existing buildings
- Waterfront businesses benefiting from: ie boats, water-skiers - walkers along waterfront, visiting West Lynn
- Opportunity to manage transport links

THREATS

- Cost of development
- Access – pedestrian, car, public transport
- Failure of the Marina Project
- Attraction of the coast draws tourists away from Lynn
- Image of Kings Lynn
- Public perception

Background considerations

- ****Vision for Kings Lynn***
 - Do we have one?
 - Eg might be something like:
 - “Kings Lynn, a town which builds on its historical assets to attract a diverse mix of residents and visitors”
 - “Kings Lynn A Town for All in All Seasons “
 - “Kings Lynn A Town in which to thrive”

Questions to be addressed

- How? – Funding, investment, interest from developers
- What? – type of buildings/homes
Eg Flats and serviced apartments for retirees
Single occupancy dwellings/flats for first time buyers
- Who? – might benefit from
Housing - mix of retired people, young working people and professionals
Tourists, attract discerning shopper
- When? – timescale

POST SWOT PRESENTATION

- Ideally the SWOT analysis would explore how officer team would address weaknesses and threats and capitalize on strengths and opportunities.
- Possibility of breakout groups ie 4 to address and comment on each SWOT – each group has 10 mins
- Discussion by members should include some members' questions some of which have been tabled in advance.
- Any additional questions arising.
- Then a round table “vote” on the recommendations and additional input.